

REMARKS / DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

Claims 1-21 are pending in the application.

The applicants thank the Examiner for acknowledging the claim for priority and receipt of certified copies of all the priority document(s), and for determining that the drawings are acceptable.

The Office action rejects claims 1-3, 9-13, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over Kang et al. (USP 6,653,795, hereinafter Kang). The applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1, upon which claims 2-10 depend, claims a flat panel display apparatus that includes means for activating an energy recovery circuit only for a part of the total number of subfields of the discharge cells.

Claim 10 claims a method that includes activating an energy recovery circuit of a discharge cell for only for a part of the total number of subfields of the discharge cell.

Claim 11, upon which claims 12-21 depend, claims a display that includes a drive circuit that is configured to recover energy from select subfields of a plurality of subfields, the select subfields being fewer than a total number of the plurality of subfields.

Kang does not teach recovering energy from fewer subfields than a total number of subfields. The Office action asserts that Kang provides this teaching at column 7, line 56 through column 8, line 10. The applicants respectfully disagree with this assertion. The referenced text does not address an energy recovery circuit, and specifically does not address selective energy recovery.

As noted in the Office action, Kang teaches the operation of the energy recovery circuit (FIG. 14) at column 29, line 39 through column 33, line 63. Kang divides the subfields into two sets, a writing subfield WSF, and an erasing subfield ESF. At column 31, line 63 - column 32, line 6, Kang specifically teaches that the energy recovery circuit is used during the writing subfield WSF, and at column 33, lines 22-29. Because the subfields WSF and ESF comprise the entirety of subfields

in Kang, and because Kang teaches that the energy recover circuit is applied during both the WSF and ESF subfields, Kang cannot be said to recover energy from fewer than a total number of subfields.

Because Kang does not teach recovering energy from fewer subfields than a total number of subfields, as claimed in each of the applicants' independent claims, the applicants respectfully requests the Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-3, 9-13, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over Kang.

The Office action rejects claims 4-6 and 14-16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Kang and Salavin et al. (USP 6,124,676, hereinafter Salavin). The applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Each of the rejected claims is dependent upon independent claim 1 or 11. In this rejection, the Office action relies upon Kang for teaching the elements of claims 1 and 11. As noted above, however, Kang fails to teach each of the elements of these independent claims.

Because Kang does not teach recovering energy from fewer subfields than a total number of subfields, as claimed in each of the applicants' independent claims, the applicants respectfully requests the Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection of 4-6 and 14-16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) that relies upon Kang for this teaching.

In view of the foregoing, the applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objection(s) and/or rejection(s) of record, allow all the pending claims, and find the application in condition for allowance. If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert M. McDermott/  
Robert M. McDermott, Esq.  
Reg. 41,508  
804-493-0707

**Please direct all correspondence to:**  
Corporate Counsel  
U.S. PHILIPS CORPORATION  
P.O. Box 3001  
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001